



OUTCOMES FOR SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT, FOR SCOTLAND

A Report for The Scottish Government, on behalf of
The Scottish Union of Supported Employment, SUSE

August 2014

Revised following commissioner comments, November 2014

By Dr Stephen Beyer and Pippa Coutts

Table of Contents

1	Background	3
1.1	What is Supported Employment.....	3
1.2	Scottish Policy and Strategy related to Supported Employment.....	3
1.3	SUSE and its role.....	4
1.4	Background to the original SUSE indicators project.....	4
2	Outline of the project	5
2.1	International.....	5
2.2	Local	6
2.3	Workshop	6
3	Local feedback	6
3.1	Relevant Policy drivers.....	6
3.2	Issues impacting on measures and collection.....	7
3.3	Most effective measures that should be collected and how they relate to action..	7
3.3.1	<i>Employability and employment outcomes</i>	7
3.3.2	<i>Health and lifestyle outcomes</i>	8
3.3.3	<i>Value for money</i>	8
3.3.4	<i>Outcomes for employers</i>	8
3.4	Who collects the data.....	9
3.5	Effective reporting structures.....	9
4	International feedback	9
4.1	Relevant policy drivers.....	9
4.2	Issues impacting on measures and collection.....	10
4.2.1	<i>Employability and employment outcomes</i>	10
4.2.2	<i>Health and lifestyle outcomes</i>	11
4.2.3	<i>Value for money</i>	11
4.3	Who collects the data.....	12
4.4	Effective reporting structures.....	12
5	Workshop with stakeholders: The way forward	12
5.1	Overview of issues	12
5.2	What should be measured?.....	13
5.3	Why should we measure it?.....	14
5.4	Who should collect it?	15
6	Recommendations and Next Steps	15
6.1	Principles of Supported Employment Outcome Data Collection.....	15
6.2	Supported Employment Outcomes.....	16
6.3	Approaches to Data Collection and Analysis.....	19
6.4	What Next.....	20
Appendices One to Three		

1 Background

1.1 What is Supported Employment

“All disabled people should receive effective, personalised support to find, stay in and progress in work” (Scope 2014)¹

Less than half of all disabled people are in employment, although the majority of disabled people can and want to work. One of the commonly cited barriers to disabled people gaining sustainable employment is a lack of effective support.

The approach to employment support found, in evidence and practice, to be most successful in securing sustainable jobs is supported employment (OECD 2010; Beyer & Robinson, 2009; Perkins, Farmer & Litchfield, 2009; Wistow & Schneider, 2007).

The aim of supported employment - which is a place and train model - is that disabled people obtain sustainable work in the open labour market, where they are paid the going rate for the job. The approach follows a five-stepped model of practice from engagement to on-going support in work to sustain employment and promote individuals' careers.

The definition of supported employment developed in Scotland in the last few years and promoted by one of Scotland's leading bodies in disability and employment, the Scottish Union of Supported Employment (SUSE), is:

“Supported Employment promotes the rights of all individuals to achieve their full potential through a model of flexible support that enables people to overcome barriers to their employability and access real jobs for real pay.”

Supported employment programmes were initially used to help people with learning disabilities, but have increasingly been extended to other disability groups including people with long-term mental health conditions. Supported employment for people with long-term mental health conditions is known as Individual Placement and Support (IPS) and is backed up by a body of evidence.

1.2 Scottish Policy and Strategy related to Supported Employment

In 2010, the Scottish Government and CoSLA published The Supported Employment Framework for Scotland, which encouraged Local Authorities and Community Planning Partners to invest in sustainable supported employment services for all disabled people and people with long-term health conditions. This was re-iterated in Scotland's employability policy, *Working for Growth*, in 2012.

¹ A Million Futures: Halving the Disability Employment Gap.

The Framework suggested an outcome framework for supported employment would encourage providers and commissioners to evaluate, monitor and commission good quality services. Through The Framework, CoSLA and the Scottish Government asked Local Authorities to include supported employment performance information in their general performance management frameworks.

However, supported employment relates to additional strategies beyond *Working for Growth*, including other employability strategies such as *Opportunities for All* (Scottish Government, 2011) that promotes the employability of young people. Supported employment is mentioned in health strategies too, specifically around developing IPS services to support the employment of people with mental health conditions: e.g. the *Mental Health Strategy, 2012-2015* (SG, 2012) and *The National Delivery Plan for the Allied Health Professions in Scotland, 2012–2015*.

Increasing the employment of disabled people is a specified aim in several of the condition specific strategies, such as the *Scottish Autism Strategy* (SG, 2013) and *Keys to Life*, strategy for people with Learning Disabilities, (SG, 2013).

1.3 SUSE and its role

SUSE was integral in the development of The Supported Employment Framework, and it has been working with the Scottish Government to raise awareness of The Framework and to develop the quality and consistency of supported employment across Scotland.

SUSE is the umbrella body for supported employment providers in Scotland, and it seeks to promote excellence in supported employment service delivery.

1.4 Background to the original SUSE indicators project

During the period of activity after the publication of The Supported Employment Framework in 2010, SUSE commissioned a study of the outcomes of supported employment. A focus on outcomes will enable service providers and commissioners to better understand the impact of interventions. Developing a set of outcomes for supported employment will facilitate inclusion in general performance management frameworks and makes it more likely supported employment commissioning is integrated within mainstream employability commissioning.

A draft report *Towards an Outcomes Framework for Supported Employment* was produced for SUSE and the Scottish Government in 2011. This study was based on using a Social Return on Investment type approach, and it identified 6 groups of core stakeholders for supported employment in Scotland. They are:

1. Service users in employment and being supported by services
2. Service users who are looking for work and are in receipt of benefit support
3. Families, carers and significant others
4. Employers

5. Community Planning Partnerships (which could have sub-groups of Local Authority economic development, adult social care services and the NHS)
6. Department for Work and Pensions.

For each of these a list of outcomes and the matching indicators to measure them was produced. The resulting framework was considered to be too unwieldy for use, particularly by commissioners of mainstream employability services who are likely to be looking to measure only a handful of indicators.

The Scottish Government therefore asked SUSE to produce a shorter list of indicators that would be useful for Local Authorities and other Community Planning Partners. SUSE commissioned Stephen Beyer and Pippa Coutts to undertake a study to produce a more succinct and deliverable set of outcomes, from March 2014.

2 Outline of the project

It was agreed that the project would have 3 components:

- Interviews with international researchers and service managers
- Interviews with local commissioners and service managers
- Workshop with stakeholders interested in the development of supported employment and/or employability outcomes measurement.

A list of contacts was agreed and the researchers introduced the project by email, with a request for interview by telephone or Skype.

The interviews sought to establish:

- What is being measured to reflect supported employment outcomes currently?
- Who is collecting the data and how?
- What are the drivers (policy, commissioning requirements, equality) for collecting these particular indicators?
- How are they being used?
- What is the result of their use in terms of further supported employment development or supportive decisions?
- Given the interviewee's experience, what would they recommend is measured in the future, and why?

Notes were made of the interviews, and they have been analysed for the report.

2.1 International

Five interviews were undertaken with international experts, in Norway, the United States, Canada, New Zealand, and Spain. Additional information was collected from documents for the Netherlands. The list of contacts is in Appendix One.

2.2 Local

In Scotland, 12 agencies were contacted for interviews. The researchers spoke to umbrella organisations, disability specific organisations, Local Authority Supported Employment services, Local Authority Economic Development departments, the Scottish Social Services Council, and a consultant Occupational Therapist in the NHS (regarding Mental Health and employment). The list of contacts is in Appendix Two.

2.3 Workshop

A workshop was designed to elicit feedback on the information gathered through the interviews, and to further discuss key outcomes for supported employment and their measurement in Scotland. Around 40 SUSE members, supported employment providers, commissioners, policy makers and relevant national bodies were invited to the workshop, which was held on June 3, 2014. The list of attendees is given in Appendix 3.

The consultants presented the background to the project and the findings from the international and local interviews. There were group discussions on “Working towards best value outcomes”, and possible future actions. Notes were taken of the discussions, comments and learning and these were analysed for inclusion in the report.

3 Local feedback

3.1 Relevant Policy drivers

Supported employment straddles departments at a local and national level, relating to several Scottish policies.

This cross over between departments and policies does not appear to help supported employment. The study found that the policy driver for a service depended on the type of organisation and its funder. For example, some services are funded through DWP so are influenced by UK Welfare to Work policy.

Many agencies and projects have more local drivers, for example local economic development or health and social care policy and strategy. Where supported employment is funded or provided from within social work, the policy of Health and Social Care integration is likely to affect services with supported employment moving into Health and Social Care Partnerships.

Research participants felt there was “no consistent message” driving supported employment implementation and its development; nor is there a politician who champions supported employment. Research participants were looking for a more integrated approach, for example health, housing and employability departments working together on policy and commissioning.

3.2 Issues impacting on measures and collection

Supported employment services are funded by a variety of different organisations and departments and those that are a part of a statutory body are based in different departments. It tends to be funding mechanisms, rather than the policies, that determine what data is collected. Providers report a lack of funding for monitoring and evaluation so they minimise data collection to that necessary to fulfil their contracts.

This variety of funding, like the variety of policy drivers, means that there is a lack of consistency on the outcomes agencies are asked to collect, and a lack of consistency in how data is used. Participants reported that supported employment outcomes are not aligned with health or social care outcomes and these services do not see employment as their business, although this is not true in all cases. Where it is true, it hampers the collection of employment related data, including statistics on the number of people with a learning disability known to social care in employment.

3.3 Most effective measures that should be collected and how they relate to action

Research participants thought that the primary impact or outcome that needs to be measured is the difference that supported employment makes to an individual client. Hence, the core measures outlined below focus on what has changed for individuals.

3.3.1 Employability and employment outcomes

The focus of supported employment is finding and sustaining suitable work for people with long-term conditions or disabilities. This is reflected in the outcomes currently measured and those suggested for a standardised outcome set in section 6.1.

Specifically, there is a requirement to measure the number of people who gain and sustain employment. SUSE's and the authors' view is that, as in the Supported Employment Framework, it is employment of over 16 hours a week that is the goal, as at this level people's income can increase.

The drawback to measuring over 16 hours only is that the IPS model does not require people to gain jobs of a certain number of hours: work of one hour per week will count as an outcome. Hence, measuring over 16 hours only will make a standardisation of measures between health and employability more challenging.

A further key measure is the sustainability of employment. Mainstream employability programmes, such as Work Choice, tend to focus less on sustainability or an individuals' career progression.

The review found that what providers thought mattered was whether clients could stay in work for years, “5 or 10 years”. Hence, it is recommended to measure how many people are sustaining work after one or more years.

In addition to employment outcomes, there was some appetite to measure indicators of gains in employability skills, which could imply progress towards employment. Outcomes around volunteering, work placements, qualifications, training and education completed have been particularly prevalent for social work services. In some cases this may be related to the services’ desire to show what they are achieving. The concern is that some of these measures are outputs (attending a training course), which do not necessarily signify any real difference in individuals’ lives.

3.3.2 Health and lifestyle outcomes

In contrast, more effective measures might consider the difference that supported employment has made to someone’s health and quality of life.

A suggested measure was whether, and to what extent, supported employment clients gaining or retaining paid work have lower requirements of health care and social care services than they did before getting a job.

3.3.3 Value for money

There is an increasing need to collect data to prove that supported employment services are good value for money. This is important not only because of the pressure on Local Authority budgets, but also because supported employment can be perceived to be expensive compared to other support services.

Research participants suggested that the data to be collected in this category will vary depending on the outcomes that funders value. However, measures might include data on the impact of supported employment on employers and, overlapping with 3.3.2, information on the changes to an individuals’ use of health and social care services.

3.3.4 Outcomes for employers

Measuring the difference supported employment makes to employers can help make the case for supported employment.

Measures might investigate employers’ satisfaction with supported employment services and their approaches, or they may focus on gathering more specific data on time and money saved in recruitment and retention by working with supported employment agencies and employing disabled people. A feasible measure might be

the number of disabled employees in a workplace and comparison of the numbers before and after intervention by a supported employment agency.

3.4 Who collects the data

Supported employment services currently collect some monitoring data. Increasingly funders, such as Economic Development Departments, are asking them to regularly report on employment outcomes.

Employability Partnerships, many of which are led by Economic Development Departments, have monitoring and information systems to collect employment outcome data from a variety of local providers. Supported employment services, e.g. in Dumfries and Galloway, Fife and Edinburgh, are increasingly moving to Economic Development funding and away from social work. Hence, Employability Partnerships and Economic Development are well placed to collect and analyse supported employment data at a local level.

Economic Development is seen as a better fit for supported employment, by national development agencies, but some barriers to this move being effective without support have been identified. For example, local Economic Development Departments having varying levels of understanding of disability issues and links to health structures.

3.5 Effective reporting structures

Supported employment service data collection is led by the demands of commissioners and funders. This study has found that stakeholders in Scotland support commissioners stipulating that outcome data be collected within their contracts with supported employment services.

However, there is a question as to how to promote collation, sharing and use of such data, particularly at a national level. The research found an appetite for an independent function to verify the data collected, analyse it, promote sharing of information between areas and promote service improvements where performance was low. However, it was recognised that a lack of available funding for such development and research activities was a barrier to this being implemented.

4 International feedback

4.1 Relevant policy drivers

In the countries we canvassed we found a range of drivers for data collection. There was an increasing interest in understanding the impact of what is being achieved for the resources invested, particularly from national Treasuries. Accountability for the money spent in terms of outcome relative to the cost of other service models was an

element of this concern. Linked to this was a concern for resources to support more people over time than was historically the case.

In the US, State governments were increasingly concerned to assess whether employment raised people above an objective level of poverty. This is a further way to assess the impact of getting a paid job.

Equality legislation and a concern for equality was also a driver for many, with establishing how many people with disabilities of different types were being supported into employment being a key concern for data.

4.2 Issues impacting on measures and collection

There had been relatively poor data collection in a number of countries. Some collected data on delivery of outcome targets and some did not. A minority monitored time limits to drive forward performance or set minimum hours work to be delivered or minimum pay levels, apart from the national minimum wage floor to wages.

It is difficult in some systems to count short-term or casual work in monitoring systems.

There is great variability across services and no real understanding of “what works.” This leads to funding of a wide range of employment support models (e.g. sheltered work and pre-vocational training) with little regard for the outcomes delivered. Agencies appear to be largely self-monitoring with the decision whether to place people in community or sheltered jobs being taken by the agencies and not the commissioner in Government. In Norway, registers kept by different agencies for different purposes lead to time lags in the system. For employer driven registers, it can take a number of years for a person newly employed to be included.

There is little data discriminating between groups of people with disabilities. Data on disability can only be derived by cross-referencing those entering employment through the disadvantage system against the national Register of Employers and Employees, which has a disability indicator.

There is also evidence of an unwillingness to share data between National, State and local levels of data collection. The definitions, and what counts as employment, are not always shared by agencies at each level and this can be a barrier to good measurement of outcomes.

4.2.1 Employability and employment outcomes

There was a consensus from respondents that we need to measure:

- the number of people getting jobs
- wage rates
- hours worked

- worker characteristics for equality purposes
- retention over time
- career development, to ensure jobs do not remain static.

In New Zealand and Canada some criteria on hours work were set, with New Zealand insisting on people working 5 hours per week or more and Canada that at least 50% should be working over 15 hours per week.

In Norway our respondents felt that measures should reflect effective fading of support over time and not reward a uniform input over 3 years of support. Support should be flexible to meet need over time and measures should reflect this.

Sustainability was not generally measured. In Spain and New Zealand it was and was usually the number of jobs sustained for 6 months. Monitoring retention over longer periods was seen as important to measure. In Norway there was some evidence that after the normal 3 years of support up to 50% lose their jobs in the first unsupported year.

Monitoring the delivery of jobs to people from different priority groups by employment services was important in Canada and the Netherlands. Here priorities were people with mild to moderate mental health issues, people regarded as having 35%-75% productivity. In Norway there was little distinction between disabled people and people who were “disadvantaged in the labour market” in terms of providing support to find employment.

4.2.2 Health and lifestyle outcomes

“Impact” was seen as a desirable measure but views differed on what should be measured. Ideas included lifestyle benefits, social inclusion and engagement and the extent to which people were raised out of poverty as a result of becoming employed. There were few examples of where this had been measured on a large scale, apart from where Universities had been involved in large scale monitoring of employment programmes using quality of life and other qualitative measures in Spain and the US.

4.2.3 Value for money

Certainly in the US, New Zealand and Spain information was collected on the number of support hours delivered by employment services. This was commonly broken down by stage in the job placement process the service had progressed the person to. In the US there was a concern to collect data on “Return on investment,” involving any increase in taxes and reduction in government subsidies to people due to their getting a job. In New Zealand information was collected on the use of additional incentives to help obtain jobs, such as grants to help with the adaptation of premises.

4.3 Who collects the data

Internationally there is no consensus on who collects data. Again this seems to follow who commissions services. In New Zealand employment data is collected by the Ministry of Social Development as well as the Ministry of Health, or the District Health Boards (for MH). In the US data is collected by the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Department of Mental Health. In Norway, the Government, through the Norwegian Labour and Welfare Administration (NAV), collected the data; while in Canada the information was collected at the Province level on a “service purchase agreement” basis. In Spain, it was the Autonomous Regions rather than the federal authorities that collected data on the basis of monitoring contract compliance. In the Netherlands data on support provided was collected by the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, while data on other support, such as health and welfare, was collected by the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sports.

4.4 Effective reporting structures

In the US there is evidence of funding being shifted from sheltered workshops to Supported Employment on the basis of cost effectiveness data collected so far. It shows positive cost benefits for the taxpayer for most States in each year for a 7 year period through using a Supported Employment model. There has been some change in legislation in the Netherlands in response to poor Supported Employment numbers, a shift to more transparent job coaching input, and a move to empower employers in delivery.

Other than this, it is largely unclear whether there has been much in the way of redirection of funding on the basis of outcome data across the countries consulted.

5 Workshop with stakeholders: The way forward

5.1 Overview of issues

Our workshop group reinforced a number of the issues reported by local interview participants. The participants said supported employment operated under a variety of policies; the approach adopted and outcome data collected by each service was largely dependent on the requirements of their funders. Agencies that provided employability support for disabled people under DWP and Local Authority Economic Development contracts generally operate under clear, robust mechanisms for reporting. However, different funders sought diverse outcomes. The group were not sure all the data they collected for funders was used to the best effect, neither were they sure how easy it was to compare data as methods differ massively across the country. Data was felt to be useful for singular service improvement but perhaps not for the wider policy environment.

The group felt that data was not generally shared well across agencies and that there were no mechanisms for sharing data between organisations. They felt that indicators should be more standardised, and that there should be a more integrated

approach, starting from the person/client, and then focusing on the services they received. They noted there might be difficulties to overcome when advancing this individualised approach to national level databases.

The group noted that data could be collected only if sufficient funding was made available for the purpose.

Within the context of health and social care integration, the group felt it was important to look at health outcomes in some future measurement system. Where co-funding was available in commissioning employment, health outcomes might be usefully integrated alongside economic outcomes.

The group spoke about national funding structures and the idea of a service model “pipe line.” It was noted that Supported Employment spans the 5 point pipeline, and did not fit well into just one point in the pipeline. A consensus on how the systems could be more effectively linked was important to achieve if Supported Employment was to progress within the Employability Partnership network.

5.2 What should be measured?

The group felt that the difference employment made to someone’s life should be reflected across a number of measures. These should include:

Job outcomes

- What was the job(s) people did?
- Was the job sustainable over a period greater than 6 months? To be an effective measure of whether the job outcome has made a real impact, group participants said that it was important to find out whether the person was still in work after some time, e.g. 3 to 5 years later, although it is recognised that collecting this follow-up data is not straightforward, and, hence, costly.
- What were the hours worked, particularly in relation to 16 hours?
- What level of pay do people receive and are the rates viable?
- Career progression

The group felt that it was important to measure wage rates in the context of reducing poverty.

Quality of service provided

- Client satisfaction surveys “so we know how people feel”
- Employer satisfaction (with skills matching, support service) and engagement
- Additional benefit Supported Employment brings to the employers’ business

In work support

- The ability to support people for longer than 6 months

Quality Assurance Indicators

- People's journey into work and their experience of the 5 stage supported employment approach
- Self evaluation tool using the Scottish Government Supported Employment Framework, outlining the values and approach of any service; ensuring quality and reassuring funders

Individual benefits/impacts

- Quality of life
- Does the individual have a lower requirement of health care and social care services?
- Is the individual healthier?
- Cost vs. benefits approach
- Value for money, based on the funder's perspective

In addition to these measures the group thought there was value in qualitative data such as case studies, particularly in terms of marketing their services.

The group noted that health and social work services would definitely benefit from supported employment but noted that healthcare providers' outcomes were not always aligned with supported employment objectives, i.e. whether someone is healthier. It was felt that healthcare providers were not necessarily interested in the employment status of service users.

It was felt that once good data was collected and submitted it allowed service providers to be more directive in terms of policy and quality — for example, promoting the key principles of supported employment services.

5.3 Why should we measure it?

The group felt that data collection was important to provide a baseline against which to measure progression and to allow continuous service improvement to take place. It was felt to be important to gather evidence for sustained funding and programme delivery in order that progress could be made year on year. Mistakes as well as successes should be recorded, and providers should share data so that all could learn from these experiences. The group noted that services are often frightened of losing funding and therefore were loath to admit to failures.

The group felt data collection provides reasons for Supported Employment services to be sustained. The group felt that once good quality data was collected and submitted it would allow service providers to be more concrete in terms of the key principles that determine whether an employment service for disabled people is authentically Supported Employment.

The group noted that health and social work clients would definitely benefit from Supported Employment but noted that the outcomes healthcare providers' pursued were not always aligned with Supported Employment's objectives, i.e. whether

someone is healthier. It was felt that this explains why healthcare providers were not necessarily interested in the employment status of service users, but that outcome measures could be constructed to underline the benefits of employment to health commissioners and help justify further investment.

5.4 Who should collect it?

The group felt that service providers themselves should collect the data, but they need some external audit or assessment to make sure they are continuously improving and looking at a range of measures without the worry of punishment.

To maximise the use of evidence in improving practice nationally, it should be gathered and considered at a central level too. Discussion around this was limited during the workshop, and no one mechanism stands out as being clearly the best and most practical for achieving this.

6 Recommendations and Next Steps

This section draws together the learning from the review, and makes recommendations on what outcome data should be collected in the future, how and by whom.

6.1 Principles of Supported Employment Outcome Data Collection

In line with previous research the review found there are a variety of sources of funding for supported employment, both nationally and locally. Generally, funders and commissioners determine the data practitioners collect. In Scotland, appearing through the messy landscape of funding and data collection, there is a trend towards supported employment locally being linked into **Employability Partnerships and Economic Development Departments**.

Indicators of the outcomes of supported employment services should be **easily measurable**. For example, qualitative indicators on the numbers of people gaining jobs (see Table One, row one) is a measure recognised as attainable, but measuring progress in terms of gains in skills is more difficult, because the skills mostly likely to predict success in the job market are contested and measures are likely to vary across areas, which means a lack of comparability.

Monitoring and evaluation of outcome data **requires time and financial input** by service providers. This should be taken into account by funding agencies when developing the contracts with supported employment providers.

The features of the supported employment approach - such as an individualised case managed support, which continues on the job - make it the employability

intervention that works for disabled people. Supported employment practitioners would like this **uniqueness and the specific barriers of disabled people recognised** within any monitoring and evaluation system. Research has shown disabled people are loyal and reliable employees, and measuring the time people stay in work is important to explaining the contribution they make.

The review has found a need for a **more integrated approach** to information collection and use. The review has found that the primary concern is to collect data that illustrates the impact of supported services on individuals. Hence, the starting point for supported employment outcomes is that **data should be collected at an individual level** and, supplementary to that, areas and services may want to focus some data collection on the nature of services the individuals received.

To make data more useful there was an appetite for **transparency, sharing and comparing data**. There is a need for this task to be owned locally if data is to be consistently gathered. The trend towards supported employment developed now being championed through Economic Development Departments provides an opportunity to mandate these departments to collect the data on that development. It also underlines the employment of disabled people as an equality issue related to national employment strategy rather than social services or health policy. Practically, consistent data collection could be promoted at a local level through Employability Partnerships. It could also be promoted centrally, for example through the National Delivery Group aligned to the Scottish Government Employability Team.

6.2 Supported Employment Outcomes

The table below lists the recommended supported employment outcomes. The core outcomes are employability outcomes, alongside an outcome seeking to illustrate the disability or health condition of service users.

In addition to core outcomes, there are additional suggested outcomes around quality of life, particularly health gains.

Table One: Outcomes for Supported Employment in Scotland

Background Information	Notes
1. No. of people/clients with different disabilities or LTCs	This would enable services to show the impact of their services on the employment of people with different challenges and to ensure equality of opportunity.
Employment core outcomes	
2. No. of people/clients with a disability or long-term health condition (LTC) who move into paid employment	It is suggested data is collected on the hours per week people work. This will enable reporting on those working over key thresholds (e.g. 16 hours) and changes in averages over time.
3. No. of people / clients with a disability or LTC who sustain their employment*	It is suggested that annually the number of years in the job is measured e.g. finding out how many clients retain work after one, two and three years. If someone left work for another (more satisfactory job) this would count as sustained.
4. Rates of pay of people / clients with a disability or LTC at start of job and during on-going employment	This (when compared to income when joining the service) will illustrate, more systematically, the impact of supported employment on people's income and it takes account of the desire to ensure people progress in work, and have a career. It is suggested hourly rate is collected with other individual level data, each year. With this you can multiply hours x pay rate, to give gross salary per week, and later find gross salary increase year to year, % gain over nationally reported inflation or national average pay rises.
Optional Outcome Measures	
1. Progression outcomes – may be required by some commissioners	
No. of people / clients with a disability or long-term health condition who gain a new qualification(s), the level of that qualification and progression in qualification levels	The idea is to take proxy measures to show if someone unemployed is progressing towards employment. Many Local Authority commissioners working within the pipeline approach require this to be monitored. As there is little consensus on desirable work skills, a more attainable and comparable proxy for progression could be an assessment of qualifications gained over time, as reported by individuals, within the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework.
2. Health and Well-being Outcomes	
No. of people / clients with a	This measure is to report on the wider benefits

disability or LTC who have less mental ill health, improve their wellbeing, reduce their use of health services, improve their relationships etc.	of both supported employment, and gaining a job, what can be called “softer” outcomes. It can be self-reported or if a measure of mental health is chosen this can be assessed with a standardised tool to assess individuals’ mental health at start and end of intervention.
3. Quality of Life Outcomes	
No. of people / clients with a disability or long-term health conditions who have increased their income above a measure of poverty	This would require collecting data on the person’s income from all sources before entering employment and after to compare to poverty level criteria. Hourly wage rate can be used to compare to Living Wage levels. Both can be used to show a percentage rise above poverty due to entering employment.
4. Cost Benefit outcomes	
No. of clients who self-report a change in use of health services, e.g. community mental health services or number of visits to a G.P.	Overtime, with increased partnership working between health and employability providers it may be possible to source this data directly from mental health services or G.P.s to determine extra costs or savings
5. Outcomes for Employers	Related to cost benefit outcomes
Reduced staff turnover due to recruiting committed employees	These are optional measures that may be of interest to local networks with employer representation. Those employers would need to play a part in the data collection.
Saving HR costs in attracting and finding suitable job candidates	

* The term “sustain” needs to be defined. The research suggested, that in line with supported employment’s principles of ongoing support in work and career progression, the real impact is people staying in work for several years, but it is costly to collect this data overtime, so a workable period needs to be agreed by stakeholders.

The number of different funders of supported employment means different outcomes are needed, hence the inclusion of optional outcomes. The NHS funds supported employment, and Health and Social Care integration could lead to more employability, inclusion and quality of life services being scrutinised by or connected to health. Hence, an outcome around improving wellbeing may be important, or if social work funds services a specific outcome in line with their goals may be required, for example around increased independence for individuals.

It is likely that increasingly funding agencies and commissioners will require value for money and some measure of cost: benefit. Exactly what will count as a benefit depends on the change the commissioner wants to see as a result of their investment. Again these outcomes may need to be developed locally, over time. However, the review found an interest (particularly in Health funded services) in measuring a reduction in use of health services. To understand the benefit of

supported employment to this, commissioners and providers will need to collect the same data, on use of health services, for all people in employment services.

Service quality and satisfaction data has not been included in the table. Measuring service quality or service user satisfaction is not the same as measuring outcomes, although higher quality services may lead to greater impact (which is the basis of the IPS Fidelity Scale). SUSE has a remit around increasing the quality of supported employment services across Scotland, and since 2013 has been collaborating with BASE on the development of a Supported Employment Quality Mark. These developments can be progressed, in addition to the introduction of the outcomes framework, with input from supported employment services and commissioners.

6.3 Approaches to Data Collection and Analysis

It is recommended that supported employment services continue to collect the data, for individuals / clients. Supported employment providers should be asked and incentivised to collect data by their commissioners. Different commissioning agencies will have different interests in what outcomes they record, but all should ensure that employment service providers who support people with long-term health conditions or disabilities record a core data set. Responsibility for the implementation of core data collection measures, across different service providers and different client groups, should reside with Local Authority Economic Development Departments, and their mechanism for achieving this should be through their Employability Partnerships. The core data should be reported centrally, for example to the National Delivery Group (NDG).

When the service collects the data it can assess its performance against the level of outcomes expected. Regular reports would be made to the commissioners. Data would be held locally with other employability data, by Economic Development Departments within a local Employability Partnership's data management system. This may require negotiation with the Partnership to ensure that the system has the capability (such as correct fields) to host the data. If Employability Partnerships held the supported employment data as a matter of course it would allow for national level access to local data on disabled people's employability. Potentially, this will add value to the collection of supported employment outcomes as data can be aggregated and compared, across areas and disability groups.

To further analyse the core data it would be useful for an independent national agency with the appropriate skills and resources to collect and analyse it, to report national level trends. It is recognised that such a function is costly, and therefore perhaps more ideal than practical, but it'd promote the quality, dissemination and use of the information.

6.4 What Next

It is recommended that a national level body or authority lead on taking forward the above suggestions, for example SUSE, COSLA, SLAED or the Scottish Government. The Employability Team in the Scottish Government and the National Delivery Group could lead a discussion with these groups about leadership, and with local Employability Partnerships, who are working with local Economic Development Departments, about how best to start and coordinate consistent core data collection.

SUSE members and other stakeholders who took part in the review are interested to continue to participate in the on-going development of supported employment outcomes and a system for measuring, analysing and using them. Hence their inclusion is important in the next steps, specifically as practitioners, service providers and data collectors and analysts.

In order to kick-start the development of a coherent outcomes frameworks, from the national level into the Employability Partnerships, targeted development work may be required in one or two areas, to be shared nationally. This may need to be supported by time-limited external input.

Appendix One: List of international contacts

Oystein Spjelkavik, Work Institute (WRI), Norway.

Dr. Robert Cimera, Associate Professor, School of Lifespan Development and Educational Science, Kent State University, United States.

Helen Robertshaw, General Manager Vocational Services, Framework, Auckland, & Chair of The Advisors for Supported Employment, New Zealand.

Tracy Williams, Canadian Association of Supported Employment, Canada.

Professor Borja Jordán de Urrías Vega, Instituto Universitario de Integración en la Comunidad (INICO), University of Salamanca, Spain.

Appendix Two: Interviews with Scottish Stakeholders

Agency	Name	Notes
City of Edinburgh Council	Rona Hunter, Economic Development	Email discussion
Scottish Centre for Learning Difficulties SCLD	Maura Lynch, Deputy Chief Executive	Face to face interview
Autism Initiatives	Richard Ibbotson, National Director Scotland	Face to face interview
NHS Lothian	Susan Prior, Queen Margaret University	Telephone interview
NHS Mental health	Jean McQueen	Telephone interview
Aberdeenshire (social work)	Carol Balcombe, Head of Supported Employment Service	Telephone interview
Glasgow Council, Social work	Angie Black, Head of Supported Employment Service	Telephone interview
Scottish Social Services Council	Ann Mairi McDonald, Director of Sector Development, Scottish Social Services Council	Telephone interview, but little knowledge of the subject.
The Alliance		Not possible to arrange an interview
COSLA		Didn't want to be interviewed
SLAED, Local Authority Employability Leads, Pamela Smith.		Not possible to arrange an interview

Appendix Three: List of workshop attendees, June 3, 2014

First Name	Surname	Organisation
Angie	Black	Glasgow Council
Julie	Bilotti	Scottish Govt.
Elaine	Black	Scottish Govt.
Bruce	Brodie	Scottish Borders Council
Maureen	Bruce	Scottish Govt.
Donna	Burnett	NHS Health Scotland
Kirsty	Butts	Autism Initiatives Scotland
John	Dalziel	SDS Scotland
Helen	Davies	Dundee Council
Angela	Hamilton	Fife Council
Brian	Hill	Capability Scotland
Michael	Hollinger	SCVO
Jayne	Kemp	City of Edinburgh
Ali	Kennedy	Angus
Paul	Lennon	Glasgow Council
Maura	Lynch	SCLD
Jean	McQueen	NHS. AHP Consultant, Mental Health
Sarah	Parker	East Ayrshire
Irene	Prentice	Dumfries and Galloway Council
Jo	Tibbles	Falkirk Council
Sarah	Webb	Stirling Council
Gordon	Wright	Stirling Council

References

Beyer, S. and Robinson, C. (2009) A Review of the Research Literature on Supported Employment: A Report of cross-Government learning disability employment strategy team. London: Valuing People Now.

Durie, S. (2011) *Towards and Outcomes Framework for Supported Employment*

OECD (2010) *Sickness Disability and Work, Breaking the Barriers. A synthesis of findings across OECD countries*

Perkins, R., Farmer, P., Lichfield, P. (2009), *Realising Ambitions: Better Employment Support for People with a Mental Health Condition*. London: DWP

Scottish Government and COSLA (2010), *A Working Life for All Disabled People: The Supported Employment Framework for Scotland*. Edinburgh: TSO.

Wistow, G. and Schneider, J. (2007) *Employment Support Agencies in the UK: Current Operation and Future Development Needs*. *Health and Social Care in the Community*, 15(2): 128-135